Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/565,674	BIERHOFF, THOMAS
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kajli Prince	2874
All Participants:	Status of Applicatio	n:
(1) <u>Kajli Prince</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Kevin Speivak</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 11 October 2007	Time: <u>11:40 am</u>	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Ap  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	plicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: n/a	•	
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed: n/a		
Part II.  SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GE See Continuation Sheet	ENERAL NATURE OF WHA	Γ WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		•
<ul> <li>☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separation did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sum</li> </ul>	. The examiner will provide a ate record of the substance	a written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
,		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Appli	icant/Applicant's Representa	tive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: I informed Mr. Speivak that claim 7 was in improper form. The preamble suggests Applicant is claiming a device, however, the body of the claim recites functional steps. Therefore, suggesting Applicant is claiming a method. Mr. Speivak reviewed the claim and left a message on 15 October 2007 around 12:10pm giving permission to cancel the claim.